

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/725,807		12/02/2003	Cor 't Hooft	F7584(V)	3326
201	7590	06/17/2004		EXAMINER	
UNILEVER	t		PADEN, CAROLYN A		
PATENT DE 45 RIVER R		ENT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EDGEWATER, NJ 07020				1761	
				DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				A ^s			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/725,807	'T HOOFT ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Carolyn A Paden	1761				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replector provided to the provision of the provided above is less than thirty (30) days, a replector of the provided above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a ly within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status			·				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 D</u>	ecember 2003.					
•=	•	s action is non-final.	•				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under I	ccordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 13</u> is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 13</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	,				
Applicat	ion Papers		•				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	•				
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority t	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in A rity documents have beer u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No. <u>10/025,296</u> . received in this National Stage				
Attachmen	ut(s)						
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🛛 Infon	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-2-03</u> .		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 1761

No obvious-type double patenting rejection has been made in this application because there is no incentive from the prior art claims to obtain the food composition of claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Zmarlicki (Polish abstract XP-002166914).

Zmarlicki discloses the use of anhydrous milk fat in the production of protein-free dairy spreads. Although triglycerides are not literally mentioned in the abstract, it is very well known to anyone with at least one course in organic chemistry with at least one class on food components that fats and oils are predominantly composed of triglycerides. The milk fat and sunflower ingredients in Zmarlicki add up to more than 60wt% triglycerides. The sunflower lecithin in the reference is at 0.4%.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zmarlicki (Polish abstract XP-002166914) as further evidenced by Desrosier.

Zmarlicki discloses the use of anhydrous milk fat in the production of protein-free dairy spreads. Although triglycerides are not literally mentioned in the abstract, it is very well known to anyone with at least one course in organic chemistry with at least one class on food components that fats and oils are predominantly composed of triglycerides. The milk fat and sunflower ingredients in Zmarlicki add up to more than 60wt% triglycerides. The sunflower lecithin in the reference is at 0.4%. Although the abstract in Zmarlicki does not literally state "margarine", most U.S. consumers, who have been to the grocery store, would recognize that margarine is a spread that is similar to butter. Desrosier is relied upon for evidence that margarine is classified as a water-in-oil emulsion containing about 16% water (p 530, last 2 lines).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 1-8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wieske (0,253,429) in view of Hollo (JAOCS 1993).

Wieske discloses phosphatide-containing compositions that are used in margarine and are anti-spattering agents. In examples 1-3, (page 5, column 2), soybean lecithin was fractionated by solvent extraction. Then the alcohol-insoluble fraction was subsequently hydrolyzed under conditions favoring hydrolysis of phosphatidic acid and phosphatidylethanolamine in favor of phosphatidylcholine. The hydrolysis is achieved utilizing phospholipase A2 at a pH of 7.5-8 at 60C for 4 hours. The final product is shown at table 1. This composition was then mixed with the alcohol-soluble fraction of soybean lecithin in a weight ratio of 2:1 and 1:2. This formulation was then used in the manufacture of margarine. The margarine formulation is shown at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6 to contain up to 82wt% soybean oil, 0,5-1 wt% phospholipid and up to 18-wt% water. Claim 1 appears to differ from the reference in the recitation of the use of sunflower lecithin. Hollo teaches that sunflower lecithin has surface activity properties that are similar to soybean lecithin. The reference goes on to provide for hydrolysis and fractionation of

Art Unit: 1761

sunflower lecithin to overcome any handling problems associated with sunflower lecithin. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the sunflower lecithin of Hollo in the margarine of Wieske (0,253,429) in order to utilize an inexpensive source of an anti-spattering agent. In this case the secondary reference teaches that each of these lecithin sources have similar properties and thus could have been substituted as equivalent sources of vegetable lecithin. This is particularly so since Hollo provides for the production of food-grade sunflower lecithin in the 1993 time period. It is appreciated that the extent of hydrolysis is not mentioned in the reference. But lecithin in Wieske is used to limit spattering of margarine. So no unobvious or unexpected result is seen to flow from the recitation of the degree of hydrolysis of the lecithin that is set forth in claims 3-5. The method of claim 13 is clearly shown in the modelfrying test shown on page 10 of Wieske.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached on (571) 272-1398 or by dialing 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAROLYN PADEN 6-8-0 RIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1390 176